UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,942	12/18/2006	Pierre Weiss	P08919US00/BAS	5251
881 STITES & HAI	7590 02/26/201 RBISON PLLC	EXAMINER		
	FAIRFAX STREET		HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/577,942	WEISS ET AL.			
Zammor maatea meerrien cammary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SUSAN HANLEY	1651			
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>ame</u>	<u>ended</u>			
(1) <u>SUSAN HANLEY</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Aaron Schulman</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 24 February 2010	Time: <u>3:00</u>				
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:					
Claims discussed: 1-4					
Prior art documents discussed: none					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:					
See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 					
/Susan Hanley/ Examiner, Art Unit 1651 (A	applicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ex. Hanley informed Mr.Schulam that the response filed 11/17/10 was non-responsive due to a shift in the invention from the originally elected product claims to a method of using the product. The examiner gave Mr. Schulam the opportunity to file another response based on the originally elected invention. Mr. Schulman indicated that Applicant wanted the non-responsive amendment letter to be issued instead.